

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, JANUARY, 1910

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Oregon, South Dakota, Washington, and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, 11 Mason Street, Cambridge.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women

Thirty-five Branch Committees; 14,549* members in 263 cities, towns, and villages.

MRS. G. HOWLAND SHAW, President.

MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,

MISS ANNA L. DAWES,

MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,

MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,

MISS AGNES IRWIN,

MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer,

Walnut Street, Brookline.

MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Rec. Sec'y.

MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y,

11 Mason St., Cambridge.

* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations and removals from the State.

THE DRIFT TOWARD MILITANTISM.

EVERY one who wishes to see the ideals of American womanhood preserved must deplore the increasing drift toward "militantism" among American suffragists.

There are many indications of this drift. When the English suffragettes began their violent demonstrations, the leading suffragist organ in this country insisted that the reports of their performances were the invention of a hostile press. But that position was long since abandoned. Instead we have apology, defence, justification. Whatever the suffragettes may do, — their personal assaults upon Mr. Asquith and Mr. Gladstone, their reckless throwing of acid upon the ballots and the election

officers at the Bermondsey polling booth, their breaking of stained glass windows at the Lord Mayor's banquet, even the attempt to horsewhip Mr. Winston Churchill, — these and similar performances are either recorded without a word of disapproval, or are characterized as "amusing," or are extenuated on the ground that the English Government is to blame. The enthusiastic welcome given in this country to Mrs. Pankhurst who, with her daughter, originated the "suffragette" demonstrations and has participated in some of the most violent of them, is significant in this connection. If, now and then, an American suffragist ventures to deplore the violence of the English suffragettes, it is at the risk of severe censure. Mr. Edwin D. Mead furnishes a case in point. Mr. Mead has long been one of the most ardent supporters of suffrage; and he participated last winter in the outdoor demonstrations about the State House in Boston. Mrs. Mead, until lately, was the President of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association. Yet when Mr. Mead, last October, ventured to print a letter deprecating the excesses of the English suffragettes, *The Woman's Journal* devoted nearly two columns to an editorial attack upon him, and charged him with writing an article which was "flagrantly one-sided and unfair."

From sympathy to imitation is but a short step. At the annual meeting of the Iowa Equal Suffrage Association at Des Moines, last October, the following resolution was adopted;

"Resolved, That the women of the Iowa Equal Suffrage Association, wishing to strengthen the cause, do endorse obstructive methods in the Legislature, and do further resolve that arrangements be perfected to carry out such methods."

It is true that the Association used the word "obstructive" instead of "militant" as first proposed, but that the meaning is the same is clear from the statements of the Iowa leaders, one of whom, Mrs. Julia Clark Hallam of Sioux City, is reported as saying: "We would go to jail for the suffrage cause. But if I were arrested, I would resist the officer to the last."

Unless the saner suffrage leaders exert a strong restraining influence, we are likely to see the violent and lawless demonstrations of the English suffragettes duplicated in the United States.

TWO SUFFRAGIST ARGUMENTS.

From a suffragist circular, which was distributed at the Food Fair in Boston last fall, under the heading "Votes for Women," the following arguments are taken:

"People say: The majority of women don't want to vote. We say: The majority never wants a progressive measure.

"People say: Women have enough to do without voting. We say: Voting takes about two minutes and can be done on the way to market."

The first argument implies that the majority is always unprogressive and therefore, of course, always wrong. It would seem to follow that the majority ought to bow to the will of the minority; but this is a principle not generally conceded in the administration of American affairs. More interesting is the plain admission that the suffragists represent only a minority of American women. That is to say, when the suffragists go before legislatures this winter, and ask them to enact measures which will give the ballot to women, what they really ask is that the ballot shall be forced upon the great majority of women

who do not want it, in order that the wishes of a small minority of women, who do want it may be gratified. This is something that legislators will do well to bear in mind, when the appeal is made to them. It is not the assertion merely of those who oppose suffrage: it is the admission of those who favor it.

The other argument is interesting as a disclosure of the estimate which the suffragists put upon the responsibilities of the ballot. Most serious-minded Americans, men and women, realize that one of the most dangerous menaces to American institutions is the too light estimate in which the duties of citizens are held, and the difficulty which is experienced in arousing and organizing and keeping aroused and organized the best and most unselfish classes of voters. It is universally recognized, among thoughtful people, that the mere act of voting is but a small part of the responsibility which rests upon citizens. There is the necessity of keeping informed upon public questions; of seriously considering public needs; and of becoming familiar with the characters and careers of men who are in public life or who want to be.

When the suffragists are reminded that women, already carrying their full share of burdens, have no time or strength to undertake these new duties, what is their reply? They answer gaily, as in the sentence quoted above: Voting is something that can be done in two minutes, on the way to market. How can any legislator be seriously moved by the demands of women who dismiss so jauntily the real responsibilities of the suffrage?

THE REACTION IN ENGLAND.

INDICATIONS multiply of a reaction of public sentiment in England against suffrage, occasioned by the militant tactics of the suffragettes.

A letter has been published in the *London Times*, bearing the joint signatures of Lady Frances Balfour and Mrs. Fawcett, from which it appears that the Executive Committee of the National Union of Women's Suffrage

Societies had unanimously approved a resolution expressing "deep and abiding disapproval of the tactics of violence and petty annoyance."

After the violent demonstration at Birmingham, when the suffragettes threw slates and other missiles from roofs of buildings into the streets, Miss Ethel Arnold, in behalf of the North of England Suffrage Society, published in the *Manchester Guardian* an appeal to the leaders of the constitutional movement "to put the crown upon their great service to a great cause by a definite pronouncement of their views at this time of grave and acute crisis." Miss Arnold went on to say: "The performances of the last few months, beginning with the break up of the Albert Hall meeting in February last, have filled the majority of the suffrage party, both here and in America, with dismay,—dismay which has deepened into disgust. The devoted women who for the last forty years have borne the heat and burden of the day are forced sadly to look on and see the tide recede steadily before their eyes."

Another phase of this reaction against the suffrage cause, induced by the antics of the suffragettes, is found in the changed attitude of newspapers and members of parliament. *The London Nation*, for example, a leading Liberal journal, and always an advocate of woman suffrage in the abstract, remarks regretfully that the suffragettes, by the use of force, "hoped to frighten men when they have merely irritated them into a blank denial of women's capacity to act with discretion in public life, or into a more rational refusal to concede a great change of political power in response to a calculated resort to violence." As to the extent of this feeling in the House of Commons, *The Nation* remarks that, while the election of 1906 yielded a majority of votes, for the most part a careless and unthinking majority, for some kind of a suffrage bill on democratic lines, there are now, according to a well-informed mem-

ber, himself personally favorable to the suffrage, "hardly half a dozen members who both believe in and would press a suffrage bill."

These evidences of a revulsion of public sentiment make no impression, however, upon the militant suffragettes. Miss Pankhurst writes to the *London Times* that stones are "time-honored political weapons" and that, until "political liberty" is accorded to her countrywomen, conscience will not allow her or her friends to give up the fight. Mrs. Pethick Lawrence writes that the rule of "no physical violence" is to be abandoned; and it is announced that "militant tactics" are to be pursued, "no matter though social order and harmony be for a time destroyed."

THE ISSUE IN OREGON.

THE issue presented in the suffrage amendment to the state constitution, which is to be submitted to the voters of Oregon at the election next November is entirely new in American politics

For the first time in our history, the electorate of an American state is asked to give its sanction to the principle that the exercise of the suffrage shall be conditioned solely on the ownership of property. The proposal is that the rich man's wife, the rich man's daughter, shall be given the right to vote at all elections, while the ballot is refused to wage-earning women, to school teachers, to all women who have no property standing in their names, no matter what may be their character, or their intelligence, or their public spirit.

It is safe to assume that this proposal never would have been sanctioned by the Oregon legislature. It comes before the voters under the referendum which permits any proposition to be submitted, however crude or undemocratic it may be, which obtains the required number of signatures.

The suffragists themselves recognize the injustice of this proposal. They make no secret of their strat-

egy. They describe their proceeding as the "one-step-at-a-time" policy. They propose first to perpetrate an injustice, and then to make the injustice the pretext for demanding the full suffrage for all women.

The conservative voters of Oregon, who have repeatedly defeated full suffrage amendments, and that by increasing majorities, have a two-fold obligation resting upon them to give a short shrift to the pending amendment. They should vote against it, because, on its face and in its immediate effect, it is undemocratic and un-American. And they should also vote against it because it is admittedly a subterfuge, intended to open the way to full suffrage for all women,—a proposal upon which the voters of Oregon have already expressed their views in no doubtful terms.

SOME POINTS FROM COLORADO.

A VOLUME "Equal Suffrage" published by Harper & Bros., gives the results of an investigation in Colorado made for the Collegiate Equal Suffrage League of New York State by Helen L. Sumner, Ph.D. Entering upon her investigations as the representative of a suffrage league, Miss Sumner had, of course, prepossessions which she would herself be too candid to deny. Moreover, many of the inquiries which she made and the results of which she tabulates, were addressed to men and women who were active in politics and public life, and whose sympathies or regard for their own personal interests would incline them to make their testimony as favorable as possible.

But while some allowance must be made on this score, Miss Sumner's evident attempt to be fair must be conceded; and the admissions which she makes are the more significant because they run counter to her prepossessions and are wrung from her by the evidence which she collected. For example, as to the effect of woman suffrage upon women's wages, there is little in what she says to encourage those suffrage enthus-

iasts who insist that the possession of the ballot will greatly improve women's economic position. As to industrial employments, she reaches the conclusion (p. 170), that "the probability is, as a Denver employer put it that 'suffrage has nothing to do with the wages of either men or women.'" As to public employments, although there are more women in such employments than formerly, Miss Sumner concludes (p. 155) that "taking public employment as a whole, women receive considerably lower remuneration than men."

If the possession of the ballot by women were to affect women's wages in any form of employment, such effect might naturally be expected in the pay of school teachers. In Colorado, if anywhere, it might be thought would be realized the ideal of "equal pay for equal work," which figures so prominently in suffrage arguments. But Miss Sumner not only concedes (p. 155) that "as teachers, also, women receive lower salaries than men"; but she adds what, from the suffragist point of view is the most depressing conclusion (p. 157), "the difference in the salaries of men and women teachers in Colorado, instead of being unusually small, is unusually large."

As to the effect of woman suffrage upon political corruption, while Miss Sumner, on reviewing the evidence, concludes that "The influence of equal suffrage over the machinery of party politics, though apparently not great, has probably been beneficial" (p. 92) and that "Upon the whole, party politics appear to be upon a somewhat higher plane in Colorado since women have voted" (p. 93), she also says, (pp. 92 & 93) "Women have been slack, even more so than men, in the fulfilment of political duties other than voting. Few of them attend caucuses or primaries, but more serve as delegates to conventions, and their presence has a slight tendency to improve political platforms and the selection of candidates. 'Planks' are sometimes introduced to 'catch the woman vote' but they are no more lived up to than the planks introduced to catch other classes of votes. Saloon-keepers and

men of questionable personal morality are usually, but not always tabooed as candidates. This, however, does not necessarily improve the standard of public efficiency or honor. Few women, compared with the number of men, are corrupt in politics, but the red-light district is freely used by the party in power, and its women are compelled, not merely to vote, but often to repeat."

As to fraudulent registration, Miss Sumner finds from the records, that there were in 1900, in Arapahoe county, 1772 women who registered fraudulently. In the same year, the number of men fraudulently registered was 3512. But, considering that women had then had the ballot only six years, it would seem to an outside observer that they were playing this particular part of the "political game" with a good deal of enthusiasm and success.

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE.

IN view of the fact that the people of the state of Washington are to vote this year upon an amendment to the constitution conferring full suffrage upon women, it is interesting to find the *Tacoma Ledger* deploring the fact that, up to the 20th of October last, only 20 Spokane women out of an estimated 10,000 were registered for the school election. Even the suffrage leaders, the *Ledger* added, had not registered.

PRESIDENT TAFT has been freely quoted by the suffragists as in sympathy with them. Precisely how much of a suffragist the President is may be learned from what he said on the subject at Columbus, Mississippi, November 2d. Here are his exact words:

"I am not a rabid suffragist. The truth is, *I am not in favor of suffrage for women until I can be convinced that ALL THE WOMEN desire it, and when they desire it, I am in favor of giving it to them.*"

From this it appears that a prerequisite to President Taft's advocacy of woman suffrage is convincing proof that "all women" desire it. That defers his identification with the movement until after the Greek Kalends.

MR. RICHARD WATSON GILDER'S recent death is a loss to letters, to art and to many good causes and charities to which he had given unselfishly his time and strength. With all the rest, it is a loss to the cause of anti-suffrage. Mr. Gilder long ago committed himself against those who would thrust upon women the unwelcome and unnecessary burden of the ballot. He presided and spoke at the noteworthy meeting of the National League for the Civic Education of Women at the Berkley Lyceum, in New York city, December 4th, 1908, and his remarks were reported, in part, in THE REMONSTRANCE for last January. Mrs. Gilder is one of the vice-presidents of the New York State Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women.

THE Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women has placed on record its sense of the loss which the anti-suffrage cause has sustained in the recent death of Mrs. J. V. L. Pruyn of Albany, in the following words:

In the death of Mrs. J. V. L. Pruyn on October 7th, 1909, this Association and the cause which it represents have sustained a profound loss.

A pioneer in our work, Mrs. Pruyn brought to it the force of quick insight, practical intelligence, strong conviction, unfailing loyalty, and unstinted generosity, through many long years. It is fitting that we inscribe on our records our appreciation of her able, courageous, and devoted activity against the efforts of the woman suffragists, for which we, in common with all conservative women of the United States, owe her a debt of deepest gratitude.

ONE of the signs of the reaction of English public sentiment occasioned by the violence of the suffragettes is the overwhelming defeat of women candidates at the elections in November for members of the borough councils. In London, out of

RECENT DEFEATS OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

IN 1907

In California, Illinois, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, West Virginia, and Wisconsin proposed suffrage amendments to the constitution were defeated in the legislatures; in Connecticut, Indiana and Rhode Island presidential suffrage bills were defeated; in Connecticut, Indiana, and New Hampshire municipal suffrage bills were rejected; in Illinois, the Chicago charter convention rejected a resolution recommending the legislature to give women the municipal ballot, and the legislature defeated a general suffrage bill and a bill to give municipal suffrage to the women of Chicago; in New York, a tax-paying suffrage bill applying to cities of the third class, was defeated; in Oklahoma, the constitutional convention refused to strike out the word "male" from the qualifications of voters or to submit the question to the voters; in Oregon the legislature declined to submit a suffrage amendment without preliminary signatures to an initiative petition; and in Texas a proposed suffrage amendment was adversely reported. In Massachusetts, a license suffrage bill was defeated.

IN 1908

In Kansas, a presidential suffrage bill was ruled out, and in Rhode Island a similar bill was killed in committee; in Kentucky and Louisiana, school suffrage bills were defeated; in Massachusetts a municipal suffrage bill and a tax-paying municipal suffrage were defeated, and in Vermont a tax-paying municipal suffrage bill; in Michigan, the constitutional convention rejected a proposal for full woman suffrage; in New York, a proposed suffrage amendment to the constitution was killed in committee; in Ohio, a proposed constitutional amendment and a license suffrage bill failed in the legislature; and in Oregon, a proposed amendment to the constitution was rejected at the polls by an adverse majority of 21,812 as compared with 10,173 in 1906.

IN 1909

In Arizona, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated. In California, a proposed constitutional amendment was defeated in the Assembly. To carry, it should have had 54 votes: it received but 39, to 37 in the negative. In Connecticut, a municipal suffrage bill was favorably reported but was defeated in the House by a viva voce vote. A license suffrage bill was defeated in the Senate. In Illinois, a municipal suffrage bill failed in the Senate, and the same body refused to enact the Chicago charter suffrage bill. In Iowa, the Senate voted, 37 to 11, to postpone indefinitely a proposed constitutional amendment, and by a vote of 36 to 12 defeated a proposal relating to the voting of women in referendum matters. In Kansas, February 17, a presidential suffrage bill was defeated in the House. In Maine, an adverse report upon a proposed constitutional amendment was accepted. In Massachusetts, the House defeated a proposal to submit a suffrage amendment to the constitution by a vote of 171 to 54, including pairs, and the Senate concurred without debate or a division. In Minnesota, a proposed constitutional amendment was indefinitely postponed in the House by a vote of 59 to 46, and a bill for a referendum upon the question was killed 79 to 27. In Missouri, a proposed suffrage amendment was adversely reported, and no attempt was made to reverse this action. In Nebraska, a proposed constitutional amendment and a municipal suffrage bill were defeated. In New Hampshire, a municipal suffrage bill was defeated in the House by a vote of 115 to 86. In New York, the judiciary committee of the Assembly voted, March 10, 11 to 2, not to report a proposed suffrage amendment. In Oklahoma, the Senate, February 17, rejected a proposed suffrage amendment, 21 to 15. In Rhode Island, a presidential suffrage bill was adversely reported and the report was accepted without a roll call. In Wisconsin, a proposal to give women full suffrage provided that a referendum to be taken in 1910 should be in favor of it, passed the Senate but was defeated in the Assembly by a vote of 34 yeas to 53 nays.

1,362 councilors chosen, only five were women. Throughout England and Wales the number of women chosen was infinitesimal. Many women who had rendered excellent public service were among the defeated candidates. The *London Anti-Suffrage Review* deplores this manifestation of the popular feeling, but it adds that, though cruel, it was inevitable. The women voters were as implacable as the men, or even more so: they "were burning to show what they thought of their shrieking and kicking sisters." The Review further remarks that "this fierce sex prejudice, which has grown with such rapidity during the last few months is a national calamity of the first order."

MRS. PANKHURST, as she waved good-bye to her friends in New York from the deck of the steamship Teutonic, December 1st, declared that her stay in America had been pleasing throughout, but added: "It is a matter of much regret, however, that

the suffragette movement has not reached greater height." If Mrs. Pankhurst could have devoted a part of her time, on her return voyage, to reading the comments of American newspapers upon the suffragette demonstrations in England, which she initiated and for which she appeared as an apologist, she would have gained a realizing sense of the extent to which the suffrage cause in this country had been set back thereby.

THAT American girl, who smashed the stained glass windows at the Lord Mayor's banquet in London, precisely what was her grievance against the British government? Which of her constitutional rights had been invaded? And when Mrs. Blatch of the College Equal Suffrage League insisted that it was "the business of the United States government to see that she is treated as a political prisoner," had she any idea how foolish the declaration sounds to the average sane American?